

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra. Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/812,809 | 03/20/2001 | Thomas D. Petite | 81607-1042 | 1207 |
| - | 590 07/16/2004 | | EXAMINER | |
| Daniel R. McClure Thomas, Kayden, Horstemeyer & Risley | | | NGHIEM, MICHAEL P | |
| 100 Galleria Pa | arkway, N.W., #1500 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| Atlanta, GA | 30339-5948 | | 2863 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 07/16/2004 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| aku | _ |
|--|---|
| D. | |
| | |
| MCE. eply to a ication in or Continued | |
| ver is later. In no See MPEP Ite extension fee extension fee under (2) as set forth in I, may reduce any | |
| | |
| simplifying the | |
| ims. | |
| ed amendment | |
| OT place the | |
| ere newly | |
| l and an | |
| | |
| | |

Advisory Action

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|------------------|-------------------|--|
| 09/812,809 | PETITE, THOMAS D. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Michael P Nghiem | 2863 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence add

THE REPLY FILED 01 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANT Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper refinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the appli

| condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. |
|---|
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)] |
| a) \square The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: |
| (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); |
| (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. |
| NOTE: |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. |
| 7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: |
| Claim(s) allowed: |
| Claim(s) objected to: |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1-11,13 and 17. |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: |
| 8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner. |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) |
| 10. Other: MICHAEL NGHIEM MICHAEL NGHIEM |
| MAICHAEL NGHIEM |
| MARY EN 7/14/04 |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

Advisory Action

Part of Paper No. 20040714

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Grabowski teaches "... the transceiver (30) configured to repeat messages received from other transceivers (54) associated with other sensors (40's of 22, 24, 26) (30 receives messages from 22, 24, 26 and transmits them to 32, Fig. 1)". Applicants argue that Grabowski does not teach a control unit with its group of associated sensors communicating with another control unit having its own group of associated sensors. However, examiner's position is that this limitation is not recited in the claims.